



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/312,797

05/17/1999

SHIPENG LI

SAR-13076

3062

36872

7590

08/19/2008

THE LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW D. FORTNEY, PH.D., P.C.
401 W FALLBROOK AVE STE 204
FRESNO, CA 93711-5835

EXAMINER

LEE, Y YOUNG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/19/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/312,797
Filing Date: May 17, 1999
Appellant(s): LI, SHIPENG

Kin-Wah Tong
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 8/3/04 appealing from the Office action mailed 5/24/02.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,748,789

LEE ET AL

5-1998

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 2, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al (5,748,789).

Lee et al, in Figures 3, 9-11, 16, 20, 35, and 41-43, discloses an object-based coding system that is the same apparatus and method for coding an input object mask as specified in claims 1, 2, and 27-30 of the present invention, where the input object mask has a plurality of regions (Fig. 16), the method comprising the steps of assigning at least one symbol (Fig. 35) to each of the plurality of regions; coding the assigned symbols of the input object mask contextually in accordance with neighboring regions (Fig. 38); decomposing the input object mask into a plurality of object mask layers of different spatial resolution (Figs. 16, 35); coding a base object layer of the plurality of object mask layers (i.e. sub-transformation blocks of a wavelet transform); and coding a next higher layer of the plurality of object mask layers (i.e. wavelets) in accordance with information from a lower object mask layer (i.e. macroblocks).

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant asserts in the Brief that Lee et al fails to disclose the decomposing and coding steps. However, throughout the disclosure, Lee et al discloses the concept of such common coding technique used in both conventional DCT and wavelet encoding systems. In particular, Figures 16 and 35 of Lee et al illustrate the decomposition of an

input object mask into a plurality of object mask layers. For examples, elements 380 and 1548 in Figures 16 and 35, respectively, illustrate one of the layers in the decomposition process. To code the next higher layer (e.g. 386 and 150-170 of Figures 16 and 35, respectively) of the plurality of object layers, Lee et al discloses the coding process in accordance with information from a lower object mask layer. In other words, the smaller blocks from the higher layer come from the same video information of the larger blocks in the previous, lower, layer.

Appellant also asserts Lee et al fails to disclose layers of different spatial resolution. However, although Lee et al does not particularly use the word “resolution” in describing the wavelet decomposition process, the concept of different spatial resolution is inherent in the wavelet scheme. To help the Board in better understanding of the wavelet coding technique, Examiner included the article “Wavelets for a Vision” by Stephane Mallat. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate two examples of the wavelet decomposition process wherein each layer is of different spatial resolution and is coded in accordance with information from a previous layer.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner’s answer.

(12) Conclusion

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Young Lee/

Conferees:

/John W. Miller/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623, for Chris Kelley

Chris Kelley

Mehrdad Dastouri

/Mehrdad Dastouri/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621